

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 6, and 13 as being anticipated by the Chou et al. reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that Col. 6, Lines 36-43 of the Chou et al. reference discloses the claimed host computer system having access to data of each of a plurality of cargo carriers, the data representing cargo transportation options available from each of the cargo carriers. This assertion is respectfully traversed. The cited portion of the Chou et al. reference states that:

"A plurality of shippers 10 and a plurality of carriers 12 each place one more orders or offers, termed bids 14 and asks 16, respectively, through an electronic network 17, to a clearinghouse 18. The placement is done via, for example, the shippers 10 and carriers 12 visiting and making entries into the clearinghouse's web site (not shown), or by direct e-mail to the clearinghouse, or over the phone, or through intermediaries such as brokers."

The Chou et al. clearinghouse 18 merely receives the orders and offers from shippers 10 and carriers 12. There is no disclosure whatsoever that the Chou et al. clearinghouse 18 can or should have access to data of each of a plurality of cargo carriers, wherein the data representing cargo transportation options is available from each of the cargo carriers. Thus, the Examiner's rejection is unsupported in the Chou et al. reference and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also stated that Col. 5, Lines 31-38 of the Chou et al. reference discloses the claimed means in the host computer system for prompting the user for and receiving from the user information concerning cargo to be transported and transportation preferences. This assertion is respectfully traversed. The cited portion of the Chou et al. reference states that:

"In the present invention, the shipper's "goods", as represented by the electronic data record of the shipper's posted bid, consist of shipping requirement, defined by the cargo that the shipper requires to be shipped

from an origin (or city) A to a destination (or city) B, the required arrival and departure time windows, the weight and volume of the cargo, the transportation mode, and the price that the shipper will pay. The carrier's goods, as represented by the electronic data record of the carriers posted offer, termed an "ask", are the offered cargo service, defined by the origin and destination places (or cities), the departure and arrival time windows, the transportation mode, the available cargo capacity, and the minimum price the carrier will accept."

The Chou et al. system merely receives a posted bid from a shipper that identifies, among other things, a "transportation mode." There is no disclosure whatsoever that the Chou et al. system can or should both prompt a user for and receive from a user information concerning cargo to be transported and transportation preferences. Thus, the Examiner's rejection is unsupported in the Chou et al. reference and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Lastly, the Examiner stated that Col. 6, Lines 22-23 and 58-61 of the Chou et al. reference discloses the claimed means in the host computer system for comparing the user information with the available cargo transportation options and for sending to the user at least one of the available cargo transportation options best matching the user information. This assertion is respectfully traversed. The cited portion of the Chou et al. reference states that:

"The present method's set of defined attributes are chosen to provide substantial flexibility in matching bids and asks, to meet practical requirements, without unnecessary complexity At the end of the auction, the clearinghouse 18 posts the results in the form (not shown) of route schedules for the carriers, and the set (not shown) of shippers that have been assigned to a route."

The Chou et al. system merely matches "bids" and "asks" and posts the results in the form of route schedules for the carriers and the set of shippers that have been assigned to a route. There is no disclosure whatsoever that the Chou et al. system can or should compare the user information with the available cargo transportation options and send to the user at least one of the available cargo transportation options best matching the user

information. Thus, the Examiner's rejection is unsupported in the Chou et al. reference and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Thus, independent Claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by the Chou et al. reference. Independent Claims 6 and 13 are clearly not anticipated by the Chou et al. reference for the same reasons. Thus, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

richardsmacmillan
Richard S. MacMillan
Reg. No. 30,085

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900